APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,269	04/02/2001	Yoshiyuki Takaku	450100-03144	1000

20999   7590   09/26/2003

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER
CASIANO, ANGEL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2182	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		**Applicant(s)**	
Offic Action Summary	09/824,269		TAKAKU ET AL.	
	Examiner		**Art Unit**	
	Angel L. Casiano		2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .	
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .		6) ☐ Other: .	

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The present Office action is in response to application filed 02 April 2001.

2.   Claims 1-16 are pending.

Priority

3.   The present application claims Priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). Acknowledgement is made of Priority date set as 04 April 2000.

Drawings

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

-   Fig. 1, "IEEE 1394 serial bus 8"

-   Fig. 1, "input terminal 15"

-   Fig. 11, "descriptor 41".

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "6" and "14" (see Fig. 1) have been used to designate two different parts. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6.   Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

7.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly

indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9.   Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Staats [US

6,618,750 B1].

Regarding claim 1, Staats teaches an information processing system (see "Abstract") including a

main information device (inherent, see "local node") to be controlled (see "controlling

application"). It is also disclosed by the cited reference, a sub-information processing device (inherent, see "remote node") connected to the main information processing device (see Fig. 2). The cited information processing device includes terminals for connecting the sub-information processing devices (see Fig. 2) with a predetermined connection (see "IEEE 1394"). Staats also teaches a memory (see "memory space") for the names of the terminals (see "device name stack"). Name data is transmitted to the controlling device through the predetermined communication means (see "device name", "controlling application", "IEEE 1394"). The controlling device includes means for receiving the name data and display control means for displaying the names of the terminals based on the name data (see "LCD display").

As for claim 2, the cited reference associates the name of a terminal with a user's input operation (see Fig. 2; "request", claim 1; "allow a user to choose", claim 2). Staats also teaches transmitting information related to the selected terminal. The main information processing device (see rejection for claim 1) includes means for receiving selected terminal identification data (see "local node requesting communication path data", claims 1 and 4). The system in the reference chooses (e.g. switches) the terminal indicated by the identification data for input/output purposes.

As for claim 3, the cited system associates the name of a terminal with a user's input operation (see Fig. 2; "request", claims 1 and 2) and allows changes in the name data according to user's input operation.

Regarding claim 4, Staats teaches an information processing device in an information processing system, (see "Abstract") which is connected to controlling means (inherent, see "local node"; "controlling application"). It is also disclosed by the cited reference, a plurality of terminals (inherent, see "remote node") connected to the information processing device and controlling means (see Fig. 2) with a predetermined connection (see "IEEE 1394"). Staats also teaches a memory (see "memory space") for the names of the terminals (see "device name stack"). Name data is transmitted to the controlling device through the predetermined communication means (see "device name", "controlling application", "IEEE 1394").

As for claim 5, the cited reference associates the name of a terminal with a user's input operation (see Fig. 2; "request", claim 1; "allow a user to choose", claim 2). Staats also teaches transmitting information related to the selected terminal. The information processing device (see rejection for claim 1) includes means for receiving selected terminal identification data (see "local node requesting communication path data", claims 1 and 4). The system in the reference chooses (e.g. switches) the terminal indicated by the identification data for input/output purposes.

As for claim 6, Staats associates the name of a terminal with a user's input operation (see Fig. 2; "request", claims 1 and 2) and allows changes in the name data according to user's input operation.

Regarding claim 7, this is oriented to the control device in the information processing system constructed by connecting a plurality of information processing devices and a control device. Staats teaches the information processing system including the claimed control device (see rejections for claims 1-6). Therefore, Staats teaches the control device, as disclosed in the present claim. Claim 7 is rejected under the same basis.

As for claim 8, this is oriented to the control device in claim 7. As stated above, Staats teaches the information processing system including the claimed control device. Accordingly, claim 8 is rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 9, this constitutes the information processing method in an information processing system comprised of a main information processing device, a control device, and a plurality of sub-information processing devices to be connected to the main information processing device. As stated above, Staats teaches the information processing system presented in claims 1-3. Therefore, Staats teaches the method directed to the cited system. Claims 1-3 have been rejected in the present Office action and claim 9 is rejected under the same basis.

As for claims 10 and 11, these are oriented to the information processing method as defined in claim 9. Claim 9 is being rejected in the present Office action, since it directs to the method for the information processing system disclosed by Staats. Accordingly, claims 10 and 11 are rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 12, this discloses an information processing method for the information processing device in the information processing system disclosed by Staats and rejected in claims 4-6. Claims 4-6 are rejected as being anticipated by Staats. Accordingly, Staats teaches the information processing method for the cited device in the system. Claim 12 is therefore rejected under the same basis.

Claims 13 and 14 constitute the information processing method for the information processing device in the information processing system. As stated above, Staats teaches the information processing device in the information processing system, as claimed. The present claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 15, this discloses a control method for the control device in the information processing system disclosed by Staats and rejected in claim 7. Claim 7 is rejected as being anticipated by Staats, since the cited art teaches the control device. Accordingly, Staats teaches the control method for the cited device in the processing system. Claim 15 is therefore rejected under the same basis.

In consideration of claim 16, this constitutes the control method for the control device in the information processing system disclosed by Staats and previously rejected in claim 8. Staats teaches the control device in the information processing system, as claimed. The present claim is rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

-    Yamamoto et al. [US 6,553,431 B1] teaches information processing system and method.

-    Shishizuka et al. [US 6,480,916 B1] teaches information processing method and system.

-    Suzuki et al. [US 6,477,589 B1] discloses information processing apparatus and method.

-    Krivoshein [US 6,449,715 B1] teaches process control configuration.

-    Beatty [US 6,134,616] teaches method and apparatus for dynamic reconfiguration of

     computer devices.

-    Pleso [US 6,009,480] discloses integrated device driver.

-    Rosenthal et al. [US 5,918,050] discloses apparatus accessed at a physical I/O address for

     address and data translation.

-    Nagano et al. [US 5,550,999] teaches information processing system.

-    Yoshio et al. [US 5,446,714] teaches disc changer and player that reads and stores

     program data of all discs prior to reproduction.

-    Bilski et al. [US 5,101,494] discloses system for producing memory maps.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Angel L. Casiano whose telephone number is 703-305-8301. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

alc

JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100